



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Richardson, Amb. 694. The same is true of an artist and his paintings. *Prince Albert v. Strange*, 2 De G. & Sm. 652, 1 Mac. & G. 25, 1 H. & T. 1; *Turner v. Robinson*, 10 Ir. Ch. 121, 510. Indeed, the publication of photographs taken of models grouped to imitate a painting has been enjoined at the petition of the artist. *Turner v. Robinson*, *supra*. Cf. *Mansell v. Valley Printing Co.*, [1908] 2 Ch. 441. It would thus seem clear that in literary and artistic lines, not only are the productions themselves protected from imitation, but also the ideas which were their inspiration. In the principal case the plaintiff desires an injunction against the use of the inspiration (the dog show), produced here by physical labor and business acumen rather than by artistic thought, which caused the creation of his photographs. That the production itself, *i. e.*, the photographs, partake rather of news than artistic achievement should not alter the rights of the parties. For the compilation of stock quotations has frequently been protected. *Exchange Telegraph Co. v. Gregory*, [1896] 1 Q. B. 147; *Kiernan v. Manhattan Co.*, 50 How. Prac. (N. Y.) 194; *Exchange Telegraph Co. v. Central News*, [1897] 2 Ch. 48. It is difficult to see why a setting produced by labor should be entitled to less protection than one created in the mind. The case presents no difficulties on the problem of publication, for an exhibition like that in the principal case has not been deemed sufficiently public to deprive the promoters of their common-law right. *Turner v. Robinson*, *supra*; *Macklin v. Richardson*, *supra*. Nor is the assignability of the right contended for questioned. *Exchange Telegraph Co. v. Gregory*, *supra*.

JUDGMENTS — FOREIGN JUDGMENTS — EQUITABLE DECREE AS A CAUSE OF ACTION IN ANOTHER STATE. — The plaintiff sued for a divorce from her husband, one of the present defendants, in Illinois, where they were both domiciled. The court granted the divorce and entered a decree directing the payment of \$4000 alimony, "to be satisfied by the conveyance" of certain land in Wisconsin. He conveyed to the other defendants, who had notice. She brings this suit in Wisconsin upon the Illinois decree to set aside this conveyance and to have the land conveyed to herself. The defendants demur. *Held*, that the demurrer be overruled. *Mallette v. Carpenter*, 160 N. W. 182 (Wis.).

A decree to convey land in a foreign jurisdiction when based on a prior equity in the land, has been held a binding adjudication of the facts to which full faith and credit are due. *Dunlap v. Byers*, 110 Mich. 109, 67 N. W. 1067; *Burnley v. Stevenson*, 24 Ohio St. 474. See *Winn v. Strickland*, 34 Fla. 610, 630, 16 So. 606, 612. The Supreme Court, however, is apparently of the opinion that no decree for the conveyance of foreign land is within the full faith and credit clause. See *Fall v. Eastin*, 215 U. S. 1. For otherwise a foreign court would determine title to domestic land. See *Bullock v. Bullock*, 52 N. J. Eq. 561, 565-67, 30 Atl. 676, 677-78; 25 HARV. L. REV. 653, 654. According to either view the decree in the principal case is ineffective, for the order to convey is not an adjudication of prior equities in the land, but only a method of satisfying an unrelated judgment. *Bullock v. Bullock*, 52 N. J. Eq. 561, 570, 30 Atl. 676, 679; *Fall v. Fall*, 75 Neb. 104, 106 N. W. 412, 75 Neb. 120, 113 N. W. 175. Nor could the Wisconsin court accept the Illinois decision, though not compelled to, on the ground that it has undoubtedly indicated the best method of satisfying the judgment for alimony. For the method of execution that follows a breach of a right is a matter to be determined by the law of the forum. Nevertheless, although the principal case is technically wrong, the result is substantially right. For, though the decree to convey Wisconsin land is ineffective in Wisconsin, the Illinois decree for the payment of \$4000 is nevertheless binding. *Sistare v. Sistare*, 218 U. S. 1, 11-17; *Bullock v. Bullock*, 57 N. J. L. 508, 31 Atl. 1024. So the conveyance to the codefendants may be set aside as in fraud of creditors. *Weeks v. Hill*, 88 Me. 111, 33 Atl. 778. See *Wolford v. Farnham*, 47 Minn. 95, 97, 49 N. W. 528, 529.